

Dewitt-Burris, ~~side~~ side 1, page 1, from 184 on original  
from 000 on dub ---dub #s follow

this  
Dewitt: OK, well I started with a/hardwired device that is going to  
we read graphs. On three levels. I got a piece of graph paper.  
It was a TTL device and I didn't build it. In the meantime I talked  
lot with Phil Edelstein whose approach to the ~~xx~~ problem was to  
plug the camera into a loudspeaker so that he could stand in front  
of it and wave his hands and say "Yeah, there's something in that!"  
So, the next stage was I built an interface with a flip-flop as  
a toggle to the graph line (??) and ~~Bill~~ <sup>Phil</sup> wrote an elaborate computer  
program for the PDP-11/10 which converted that information into  
a string in the computer core. And he could output it at any  
speed based on his clock. So it was a graphically-loaded oscillator.  
No one was interested in it. I thought it was the greatest thing  
on earth but it was a little too abstract.

Jon: What was the year?

Tom: I'm not sure, 74 perhaps. It was in the autumn that I ~~started~~  
~~building the boards~~ built the boards and Phil started debugging  
the program. It took a while. It never worked perfectly because  
Our key circuitry was a TTL junction and (inaudible). But we  
demonstrated it and sent applications to the NEA to be funded through  
Channel 17 (WNET) and the Arts Council got interested in it and  
funded it for a year and in that period of time ~~the~~ we built the  
version that you now see. The Arts Council supported this thing  
for two years they gave me \$10,000. First we bought the off line  
stuff, which came ultimately much later. it came almost (inaudible)  
as the home-made stuff. But the second year we got funded just for

the home made stuff.

Jon: How much did they give you? ~~The~~

Tom: They gave us two ten thousand dollar grants that went to WMHT. Initially it was a portion of the WMHT portapak budget. It wasn't even half of it but it was a significant portion. I think they got \$25,000 and we got \$10,000. The second year it was supplementary to their proposal. But their whole amount of money came out to be the same. It amounted to the same thing for them, because they expanded their facility. They were Japanese portapaking at the same time as we (inaudible). The computer, however, is worth money because it came from a granted project they received a long time ago. It must be about six years. The computer's now worth, you know, \$19.95. Actually, that's not true. It's an 8, of 8 and they still have a limited market ~~for~~ mainframes. But you can buy the chip. And we could make the software operate a microprocessor with the 8 instruction set, but the next step is the Sol over there. The Sol is probably more portable. It's the Sol 10, it's a kit. It's one step above the PC boards. It comes with a power supply, and a keyboard sufficient to address the (inaudible). It doesn't have any slots. It only has 1K of ~~RAM~~ RAM, like the (inaudible). It costs \$900 and you build (inaudible). It was built by Jerry Jones, who is a very nice person.

Jon: What was the idea of using a graphic input to this device.

Tom: Isn't it obvious. Electronic Body Arts is a group of dancers and they had initially done a tape called "Multiple \_\_\_\_\_ Marathon" with the sound track from "Bye, Bye Birdie" and cut it from an hour and a half to 40 minutes. And then we had three afternoons

in the SUNY facility in which we made a black and white tape. I edited the pictures to the (inaudible). And the initial step by those dancers was a success. So I thought, why not stay associated. And out of the joint group, Phil Edelstein was a founding member of EBA, and Georg-Kindler was. So this project was born. It is as much Phil's doing as mine. In fact, the technical side of it is far more Phil's than mine. If madness and a stupid desire to use the thing is required, that's mine. (inaudible, but something about zero ability with machines . . .) Some other people might have said why do it until it's perfected. But I said how can it be perfected unless you try it and see what you can do with it. And a few of the moves that were developed I think will be seen in industry as the result of artists involving themselves in the development of their instrument, which is <sup>a newer (or intermediate)</sup> ~~an intermediate~~ <sup>that</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>similar</sup> ~~systems~~ <sup>step</sup> ~~which~~ we are all taking now. There are ~~some~~ systems which involve tracking chrominance systems, such as Vital Industries and Grass Valley switchers and tied to frame buffers which are Rutt/Etras without that incredible ~~amount of non-linearity~~ <sup>so</sup> non-linearity. (inaudible) The prices are now approaching the cost of the original system. We hope the system will work soon enough that it will be cost-sensible <sup>for</sup> ~~to~~ the Arts Council. So far it's vastly cost-sensible because the industry electronics and our electronics come from two different points of view. They are wasteful and \_\_\_\_\_ . . .

Jon: So the graphic input to the system

Jon: So the graphic input ~~to the system~~ through the CCD camera . . .

Tom: ~~What's a CCD camera?~~

Jon: The 32 by 32 camera (rest inaudible)

Tom: Well, that came from a joint mulling over things between

Phil and John Driscoll. They were interested in the Cronenoco.

(inaudible) on the Hearn. As I said, it's sort of faulty, because the level of sophistication is a little high and we are now in the process of one step back, two steps forward because we really want people to see that graphic inputs are useful. Most people would find the matrix confusing (inaudible). But putting in the traces of movement and correlating illusionary spaces with real ~~spaces~~ spaces is intuitive to the industry and intuitive to the artists. John Godfrey really likes the synchronized mouth ~~piece~~ piece, because they spend an enormous amount of time and labor, awful and cruel labor for ~~an~~ an artist who likes to dream. And I've seen meth-heads . . . inaudible . . . who kill themselves who may have to die because of all the sequential movements which are required in animation. So those people will be happy to see the Pantograph<sup>a</sup> And at Cornell when we can do hard edged graphics inaudible . . . /in the Architecture School that uses computer graphics system in the same way that cel designers<sup>a</sup> uses graphic systems for animation. inaudible digression. So, if you combine the sensing output of the Pantograph with skilled movements of actors you have an input device to a computer like that which eases the burden on animators quite a bit... inaudible

Jon: But the programming control . . . its a non-real time programming. You're storing your switching points in the inaudible

DeWitt-Burris, page # 5, side 1 132

Tom: Oh, being able to direct changes in the analog synthesizer. Well, you have buffers, so it's like a light pen. You can use it as a light pen. The software you develop for it includes the inditating trace against the clock that's internal to the computer. You don't have an ~~internal clock~~ external clock on it today. We might have it one on it by September 1st . . . we haven't really checked it. The last time we checked it there was a general electronic problem inaudible. Phil did all the digital drawing and George did all the corrections. And George has done the analog drawings as far as the drawing has taken place inaudible the rotation system although inaudible. But he's on salary inaudible

Jon: George is on salary?

Tom: Yeah he's under a cost of living salary.

Jon: From Electronic Body Arts?

Tom: Yeah. He works so <sup>really</sup> funcking hard. He/does things for people because they're his ~~fix~~ friendsx and not for the money. Just because they're his friends. He didn't come to the conference in Buffalo. I want that on the record. George was not there, he was working for somebody else.

E Vibeke: He was also not invited. That chat not relevant.

Jon: Are there any things you can tell me about factual development of the Pantograph system or the Design Device. ~~Now~~ The Design Device is seen as a n expansion and realization of the Pantograph system?

Tom: Well, we built the prototype design device control unit and then se built the Pantograph. The Design Device control unit we built

was based on an 11/10 the access to which was through the music department and SUNY/ECC. Well, I've been excommunicated in a way. I tried really hard to get into SUNY and I found myself removed from that environment by Patty Ross. Oh, you didn't press the pause button! How did that happen. We feel relieved that we're not in SUNY, because it's obviously not a proper institution for us. But the Design Device we developed is inaudible. Now there was an 11/10, an equivalent 11/10 at Channel 17. An identical machine, everything, the tape drives the whole thing. So we asked 17 to let us use their 11/10 and they said we couldn't use the 11/10. And naturally we ~~asked what~~ were curious, well what were you using it for? an they said well, we've already spent \$100,000 but we cant make the thing do what we want it to do and we're putting it in a closet.

Jon: What did they want it to do?

Tom: They wanted to remotely control thier transmitter. That's all. But we couldn't get it to work, and they couldn't get it to work and the more money they poured into it the less reliable it became. <sup>They</sup> ~~We~~ finally put it in a closet and that's where it is today.

~~As far as I understand. They~~ It became something they didn't want to talk about. They were Nazis, they ~~did~~ would not talk about it.

Jon: They were embarrassed as well.

Tom: Yeah, they were embarrassed. It's a deep dark secret, and I asked engineers about it and they said yeah, it sounds like just what you need. So the Design Device. Well, we made that cover at ~~WMT~~ <sup>WMT</sup>, we could have implemented that if MHT had said "OK, here's the 11/10

Dewitt-Burris, page 7      side 1 196

can we do it.?"

~~xxxxxxx~~ But basically they said "what the hell do we need it for . We're a public broadcast station not an Arts Council outpost. We're not an Arts Council outpost, get rid of it all!"

And they dumped it.

~~xxxxx~~ Jon: WMHT had one also?

Tom: They had an 11/10.

Jon: and the State University had one also?

Tom: Well, the State University's 11/10 and the Arts Council's program aren't all that compatible, because the Arts Council can't fund the University. So while I dissolved it there I had to get the funding from the University and not the Arts Council. And the University wasn't interested.

Jon: ~~xxxxxxx~~ So, you got funded at WMHT . . .

Tom: I got funded at WMHT and the University has its own funds and they both had 11/10s and I developed the system at the University but I couldn't continue it because the University wasn't supporting it. And I couldn't continue it at WMHT because they weren't supporting it, so the Design Device became stalled. The Pantograph continued based on WMHT's support and the University's support too. The University supported that by letting me use the performing arts center as a base. WE used all the test equipment at the Electronic Music Studio which was very good equipment. And we used their theaters, which are superb theaters. So the Pantograph was getting it up the ass, and the Design Device was being left in the cold because no one ~~wax~~ really was supporting it.

End, side 1



Tom: Well, I'll tell you . . .

Jon: I'm just trying to get this absolutely clear.

Tom: I do a lot of things for people and I say for a while I was doing things for them.

Jon: So that you ~~have~~ had some kind of informal cooperative arrangement with WMHT.

Tom: Yeah. Quite informal. So informal that when they applied for Arts Council funding the year after the initial grant they wouldn't show me their application. When I finally learned what it was it seemed like what they wanted to do was go out and buy what we were building. Which is probably what they should have done with that computer because you can buy a transmitter controller for \$18,000 off the shelf and they spent \$100,000 on a computer system and couldn't get it to work. Now, we got something going that works and they don't want it. You can probably buy something off the shelf that's supposed to do what we're doing and probably won't work because the engineers that are building it don't have the input from the artists who would use it. And there's an important communication the gap that has to be bridged in the industry. So what I've seen so far of tracking chroma-keys is not so interesting. Well, they do have motion detection and motion detection on rhythm. Which I didn't demonstrate to you. We haven't perfected it because it requires hardware multiplication which we can't do in the computer. But the industry offers for \$29,000 a box that does a hardware multiplication that detects velocity and can do a very exciting form of keying called velocity keying detecting keying. And in that system you can reinset a picture at the points where the rays of motion are



specified. You can separate one part of a scene from another. You can take the entire background and remove it that way. It's great. Great Stuff. CBS in collaboration with the French Concern, CSF, engineers in Stamford Connecticut built that and published the specs in the SMPTE Journal in March ~~with~~ with a theoretical article that's very interesting. We can do it eventually, but in these cases I'm tempted to ~~say~~ say to ~~womeone~~ who's interested, why don't we go out and get that box. It has a frame buffer ~~in~~ <sup>ing</sup> it too and the frame buffer address <sup>ing</sup> is very important. We have access to a chroma decoder which is something that we can implement with that kind of data. Inaudible. I thought . . . I built a time base error corrector but tore it apart.

Jon: The one bit corrector?

Tom: Yeah, somebody wanted a proto board so I removed all the chips. And I keep wondering inaudible. But ~~frame~~ buffers of course will do that. It costs \$25,000.

Jon: one of our concerns is to deal with language, a standardized language to discuss video. Specifically to discuss ~~f~~ video effects and inaudible.

Tom: Well, the matrix is one approach. And the waveform as a time That's the way I see it. record./You have the waveforms assigned to the channels. You have the change in those waveforms control simultaneously to the switches. And that's all on paper. I saw it as a hand written document so that it could be duplicated by a xerox and to notate it you wouldn't be required to be ~~xxxx~~ at the site of the computer or a machine like a card punch.

equally  
Jon: But in the car you were talking/about the necessity to evolve a certain set of languages that would function in a way like the set that exists for film, in which you could write down on a piece of paper your instructions and have somebody else do your processing for you.

Tom: Yeah. Vibeka, do you want to show him what you did with the sound track from "Templb." You know, the graphic language.

She's done work this way and so has Gershwin, you know. ~~And many~~

Jon: And many other composers, in fact.

Tom: It's a good system because it's very much like musical notation and music is our best reference for time-varying art forms. After all, pictures never moved before except for dance, which is very limited in what you can call pictures. So you have to take a tip from the guys who have been doing it for 500 years. They are homo sapiens, some of them with highly developed intellects. Ludwig von ~~Beethoven~~ <sup>Beethoven</sup> and Wolfgang Amadeus Moogzard. Oh, did I mispronounce his name. Well, the thing is you can use a Moog and you can notate for it properly and make a piece on paper and have it realized again and again with the actual instrument much like composers did. And inaudible the recording media become more and more improved with time, so it has an enormous advantage to write something now and maybe realize it with much greater resolution later. So we're really interested in that aspect of ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ notational systems. The only instrument that I'm though familiar with/is that simple one, the graphic guitar of the Rutt/Etra and the Hearn. So what's not on the Hearn are oscillators,

but the oscillators . . . synchronous waveforms, but those can be built with graphic inputs and that would be the composer's access ~~access~~ to that particular instrument. I don't generally hook cameras up, you know it's like . . . the spaces you want to create from your mind are not available in the real world. They're just simply not available. Simply realistic recording is something I couldn't imagine because the reality is too fantastic for my mind. If you get into high fidelity reality, which is three dimensional and every inaudible and the whole thing is real, I mean that's not what goes on inside my brain. I imagine abstractions.

Jon: What ~~other~~ other ideas have you evolved for the notation.

Tom: We do use the keyboard with words in a macro et of instructions in Pantomation with a set of selections that come out as a list. They're called . . .

Vibeke shows me now her score for Temple or an earlier part

also scores for Videocean

Does

Jon: ~~Was~~ this keyboard entry involve a set of standardized language? We link the strings by

Tom: Machine language. We call it "initialization." and we have a vocabulary. Some of the inputs are . . . because the Pantograph is there, we're initializing a lot of stuff with the Pantograph. In those the long run, ~~that~~ might be built into inaudible what you want. Like I was saying, the sampling rate, we have a program for changing the sampling rate. You can utilize it at a fixed value or you can make it covariant with movement, it's that motion detection./We just (set?) X to Y. We don't have an equation to derive the vector in real time, so we give an approximation. And that changes the setting for

the sampling rate of the device. But it could be initialized when you ~~xxxx~~ had event ~~xxxx~~ that you wanted to study. And inaudible you could make a decision later on. We're hoping that the workshops will ave that kind of effect that people will try to, say, the different ideas and will be able to sketch out a piece with this primitive, our primitive inaudible. I don't think it's going to be universal. I'm looking for someone elses universal language in a way. It's a whistle and bell, the Pantograph. It certainly tells you that the train is coming and where it's coming from and how ~~af~~ fast it's moving. And where it's going to go isn't under your control. So, ~~xxxxxxx~~ it puts a lot of data on the bus, so to speak. We don't have a good set of instructions ~~xxxx~~ for manipulating the images drawn, such as straightneing curving lines. You don't have any hidden line algorithms available. You don't have extrapolation. Now weve designed extrapolation devices for imporving the resolution of the line but they're strictly linear. ~~xxxx~~ spline counts, they're not ~~xxxx~~ functions that ~~xxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ you find at Csuri's system. And we don't have the Meyer's ~~xxxxxxx~~ algorithm for hidden lines. But we have a lot of other Meyer's algorithms though. Because Roger Meyers is our pro-  
grammer. So far Roger's programs, ~~xxx~~ he's working on it right now. "Studies in Spatial Algorithms." Mobile colors stuff. In the mobile colors program youcan score the colors in ~~xxxx~~ strings that comeout serially or in parallel. You can have a waveform or matrix point simultaneously addressed. It comes out, for example, in the vector dump operation, you draw a picture and you pick it up and carry it around. That's the way it looks. And you can

do that simultaneously. That's a Meyer's algorithm that's really ~~nif~~ nifty. He writes in machine language. Incredible character. I mean, he's just wonderful, Roger Meyers. He has a dimension on his

head. He works with Joel Chadabe and has written a play in which Joel sells under license to interested users. Our program

doesn't have any kind of flag, we just call it Roger's . . . spell!

~~with~~ Phil has contributed too, and at some points Roger's use-fill (?)

~~transitive~~ subroutines, I don't know (inaudible) clocked down on

the initial fill-load of the ~~initial~~ big program for the Design

Device was 200 machine language steps. That was the graph reading

device, but that's an 11/10 16 bit computer language with

assumption of an interface board that you don't find everywhere.

Other forms of notation other than graphs and entries?

Jon: What about language used to talk about these things? To describe them?

Tom: Boolean Algebra is very important. Mathematics in general is very important if you want to talk about what's going on here.

It's an excellent reference. The programs in Boolean have to be built up to a point where they are doing transcendental equations.

Jon: What's a transcendental equation?

Tom: These are the curve functions like the sine, cosine and your returns back, you know, it oscillates. And other functions.

Fourier analysis is important, but that's not a transcendental equation, I don't think they categorize it that way. But Fourier and its associated practice is apparently important not only for what we're doing, which is silly, but they have holography

based on it and if you can see the overlapping radiation patterns, 2 or three points' antennae radiating put together that space, you can map a three dimensional object in coded form. It's much more economical in storage capacity than repetitive planar data of our keyer systems.

Jon: Where ~~had~~ did you get the idea for the Pantograph system?

~~What~~ What was the necessity of developing a specialized system for these purposes?

Tom: Well I said, we didn't have the support/to implement the <sup>on the 11/10</sup> old ~~11/10~~ Design Device, but we have the/funky 8 and we found an audience of people who appreciated the simplified version of the Design Device. We ~~had~~ also had shif the money that we had hoped ~~for~~ the Design Device. We needed \$20,000 research grant money and, you know, any . . .

Jon: My question was misstated. The reason for developing , for planning out, the plotting of the Design Device, ~~was~~ <sup>to do</sup> what was the incentive ~~for~~ this? What was the necessity for this? What were the effects? The people who influenced this?

Tom: Well. I could say the tracking chroma key systems is being implemented. Yet they derive some serious problems in video that have to do with correlating to input sources in position. They have sources that can be superimposed, but positioning of them is hard. When this relates to the \_\_\_\_\_ it is being cheated a lot and it doesn't work. Like you have the camera zoom simulate a move that isn't actually taking place. To corellate it to some move that really is taking

place. And you sustain the ~~illusion~~ illusion of geometrical space, of two input space. You have a lot of travelling matte photography in fantasy films in which this kind of effect is called for. Wherever the set is not the real set, but the set is brought in from another source as an illusion you get scale problems, you get movement correlated between the second input and the foreground. There's a problem and you can solve it in all different ways naturally. Somew ways the rear project the illusion other places they use travelling mattes and they animate the travelling mattes, optically printing and moving the printing head around. And ~~that~~ that hadn't been done in video, so to do it tracking chroma key systems have come about. I didn't hear about tracking chroma key for long after I

\_\_\_\_\_ animation. Out here in Albania, the Betamax is still  
a  
not agreed upon as ~~the~~ real thing. Some people say it's just a hoax. So I mean, inaudible. That they would have that problem, that production problem they've always had. That's one important aspect of the Pantograph. And when we proposed it I think other people say it that way.

Jon: So they idea for you is in someway derived from film technology and film processes of things you could realize on film. Is that correct?

Tom: ~~Yes~~ Yeah, sure, you might say it defives from that. Sure, I've had a problem in film.

Jon: And you wanting to do these kinds of things in video and found them inaccessible?



Tom: Yeah, it's still pretty inaccessible.

Jon: And so that the reason for designing the system to do this was, perhaps, that you could envision a system that would allow you to do such things?

Tom: Yeah, I was thinking recently that when I met Stan Vanderbeek I was very impressed with his work, because it was very similar to something I had done, and I didn't show it to him., because (inaudible) . . . he had me employed, I was his apprentice. And so the day I was ready to leave, Stan said, . . . I walked ~~xxxx~~ out from under his wing and I go out there into the real world and I brought back this collage film. That's funny, he looked at it, he was very quiet, he didn't say anything very much. And ~~suddenly~~ suddenly I was swept with this inspiration. " You know what I'm going to do," this was like 1965, "You know what I'm going to do next some day, I know what I'm going to do with my lifetime. I'm going to make a system to make it possible to combine animation like this collage animation with actors moving in front of <sup>a</sup> the camera like we all, can/shoot <sup>go out and</sup> at any time." Stan was capable of doing that too. He ~~was~~ was used to making films with actors, "Summitt" for example, which you probably haven't seen, but he's got an impersonator of Krushchev and Kennedy. Very well acted because they look just like them and it's all done in mime. But he cut to animation, they weren't simultaneously operating in the same space, because how could they have been if they were actors on a stage. And they didn't know where they were, and

he couldn't make that happen in exactly that space. He brought great props in and correlated to the animation. Very well conceived. I didn't watch that film come together, I ~~walk~~ watched him finish it and put the sound track on. Just to get it exhibited for the first time ~~wix~~ or something. I said, "I will do that, I will do that." Tom mumbles some dialog between him and vanderbeek, indistinct. It was a really positing something funny existential moment where I was ~~indistinct~~ and now it's coming to pass. And at the same time I was positing ~~something~~ that I ~~wix~~ was thinking with some sense of disappointment that it simply wasn't enough. And I had another idea that I wanted to do which had to do with political used of two way communication which at the time was highly unformulated. But I knew about democracy because I'd just gone to Columbia and I spent a couple of years studying ancient institutions and I was really hooked on the Greeks. And I was really hooked on the Greeks. I loved Homer and I loved democracy. I was like passionate. And Stan took me away from Columbia, because they didn't teach film, so I was removed from those concerns. But at that time, with that empty feeling I thought I'd like to do this other thing too. And that uses magic stuff where involved in the medium, where involved in the medium it summons forth illusions of things that don't exist except in yourmind, to allow some kind of ~~xx~~ broadbased communications in society that doesn't currently exist. And I'm really hooked on that now. I'm involved

with the National Federation of Local Cable Programmers. I tell you that story because you asked where ~~du~~ did the idea come from, and I remembered that conversation with Stan although he probably doesn't remember it. But it was in the old film building down on 9th Avenue and I projected "The Power of the Human Mind" for him. And he sat in Sy Freed's (???) viewing chair because Sy Freed used to lend him the editing room, and I sat back there to make sure the projector didn't tear the sole print of his film which still exists as a sole print, which is ~~now~~ now torn. And afterwards I went in there and turned on the light and (mumbles) and he didn't say anything. He just didn't say anything very much about it at all. I passed beyond that in his own work and he couldn't stand to see any more \_\_\_\_\_ collage animation. He was working in Bell labs and doing computers. I think that's why he didn't want to talk about it.. It was so much like his early work, that you could cut it right in to his early work and you wouldn't know it except that it was too clumsy and crude. The first thing. And maybe the last thing, because/subsequently<sup>the</sup> collage animation I did Vibeke did the collage animation. I mean she prepared collages. I did the fumbling under the camera routine, but she's the artist whose collages you see over there on the wall. So it may have been the very last time I ~~did~~<sup>do</sup> that, but as far as combining that stuff with live action I'm ready for it and I've even done some of the live action, for

want of a better mime at the time, who would do it for nothing,  
on the budget we have. "Outer Space," "Outer Space," Jesus,  
I don't know. Your regation to Outer Space was just what I  
expected it to be. Just exactly. You performed . . . it  
performed itself. They say that sometimes the things that are  
done first are done best, but that's not my contention. I think  
music performed for the first time invariably is unrefined  
(sic)  
because its the first hearing to the performers. They haven't  
felt all the lines yet. The composer's presence would surely  
help, but you know, Beethoven is conducting while he's deaf  
gives ~~xxxx~~ the lie to the hypothesis that its the first and the  
best at the same time, because those musicians just had to try  
ignoring him. He was the guy who was hearing in his head. They  
took him off the stage because the piece was over and he was  
still in the last movement somewhere. That's the famous story.  
Well I think that's true. I don't think the first time something's  
done is the best. And on the other hand there are arts that  
are practiced so well that they always are the best. They're going  
to be art, called art, by tomorrow . . . ~~xxxxxxx~~un/intellig-  
ible. But you can't really be called mime unless you've travelled  
to higher altitudes because it's already been charged. And with  
"outer Space" its funny because it incorporates an art that has  
to be performed to perfection. It's something that's being done  
for the first time. So there is an awful feeling for me about it.  
But from your point of view, I dont know. You should see that's  
its the first time. You know, experimental video, experimental

film. You're not an esthete from the theater world. That there  
are elements of practical . . . (break here)

End of Dialog